



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

# THE AMERICAN INSTITUTE OF SACRED LITERATURE

---

## A PROFESSIONAL READING COURSE ON THE ETHICAL TEACHING OF JESUS. III

---

Conducted by

CLYDE WEBER VOTAW

Associate Professor of New Testament Literature, University of Chicago

---

### Part III. The Relation of Jesus' Ethical Teaching to the Old Testament and to Judaism

On this topic the books to be read are Mitchell, *The Ethics of the Old Testament*; Hughes, *The Ethics of Jewish Apocryphal Literature*.

Historically viewed, Christianity was a higher Judaism. The ethical teaching of Jesus was a higher interpretation of the best ethical teaching of the Jewish people, based upon their Old Testament Scriptures, in the first century A.D. Jesus was a representative Jew of his day, and an exponent of the finest Judaism. However, he was not a mere repeater of what other Jews were thinking and saying. Instead, he had superior ethical insight, judgment, enthusiasm, impulse; he had a higher power of expression and of effectiveness; he was a creator in the ethical field—not a creator *ex nihilo*, but one who could reconstruct the best ethical materials of Judaism into a new, a higher, ethics that was destined to become the moral ideal of the whole Mediterranean world and of occidental civilization.

The Old Testament was the standard of Jewish faith and practice. It was diligently studied by the Jewish moral-religious teachers and leaders, and it was systematically taught to the people in the home and in the synagogues. The Jews were unsurpassed for piety and moral earnestness. Jesus represents these qualities at their best. He knew and appreciated the Old Testament thoroughly. It was to him, as it was to them, a sacred literature, full of the revelation of God's character, purposes, actions, and demands. He said that he came to fulfil the Law and the Prophets, meaning that his message was to be regarded as the message of the Old Testament in a higher interpretation, a fresh disclosure of God's will for men, impressing the eternal issues of obedience and disobedience. Jesus especially pointed out and urged the deeper moral principles underlying the statutory provisions of the Pentateuchal Code. The statutes provided that men should not kill or steal or commit adultery; Jesus reinforced these prohibitions, but also strongly interdicted the feelings of hatred, covetousness, and lust that prompted such acts. He insisted upon less ritualism and more humanitarianism in the exposition and enforcement of all the Law. He criticized severely some of the "traditions of the elders" which made the Law a "heavy yoke upon the necks" of the people; he stood for freedom, simplicity, individual conscience, and initiative in the religious life.

Jesus attempted, not an abrogation of Judaism, but a reform. The Judaism of Jesus' higher interpretation was a more lofty, winning, and forceful ethical religion than the standard Judaism of the scribes and Pharisees. The difference between his message and theirs was so considerable that they opposed him to the death. The superiority of Jesus' message is self-evident to us; it was also obvious to the Mediterranean world of the first century A.D., which took up Christianity and made it a world-religion where Judaism had failed. The whole historical process by which Hebrew religious ethics developed into the Old Testament religion, and from that into the Judaism of the first century A.D., and from that into the gospel of Jesus, and from that into universal Christianity, is a most fascinating and instructive study in the growth of civilization.

The information is available for this study in the Hebrew-Jewish writings from the eighth century B.C. to the first century A.D. We may for convenience divide these nine hundred years of history into three periods of three hundred years each: 800-500 B.C., 500-200 B.C., and 200 B.C.-100 A.D.<sup>1</sup> From the earlier portions of the Old Testament literature we may gather the ethical teaching of the first period, 800-500 B.C., which we may call Hebrew ethics. From the later portions of the Old Testament literature we may gather the ethical teaching of the second period, 500-200 B.C., which we may call early Jewish ethics. And from the Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha, as well as from the New Testament, Philo, Josephus, and the rabbinical writings we may gather the ethical teaching of the third period, 200 B.C.-100 A.D., which we may call the later Jewish ethics. In this third period we have the immediate antecedents and environment of Jesus and Paul, out of which arose the Christian movement.

The best acquaintance with Jewish ethical teachings is to be obtained by a direct and full reading of the literature mentioned above, which is our source material for this knowledge. In the Old Testament one should especially read Deuteronomy, I and II Samuel, Psalms, Proverbs, Amos, Hosea, Isaiah, and Jeremiah. In the Apocrypha one should especially read I Maccabees, Sirach (Ecclesiasticus), and the Wisdom of Solomon. In the Pseudepigrapha one should especially read I Enoch, Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs, Psalms of Solomon, IV Ezra, and Aboth.<sup>2</sup> In the New Testament one should read especially the first three Gospels and the Epistle to the Romans.

Mitchell's *Ethics of the Old Testament* and Hughes's *Ethics of Jewish Apocryphal Literature* are excellent concise expositions of the ethical teachings contained in the Old Testament and the later Jewish literature. They present a comprehensive résumé and discussion of the material, and give a good idea of what the source writings contain. The scheme of these two books is somewhat different. Professor Mitchell chronologically arranges the component literary parts of the Old Testament (books, portions of books, and documents) from the

<sup>1</sup> The division years, 500 B.C. and 200 B.C., are not chosen with reference to any specific events that happened in those exact years, but as a general date indicating a comprehensive transition.

<sup>2</sup> An admirable and convenient edition in English of all the Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha, with introductions and notes, is now at hand in Charles's two-volume work, *The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1913. \$19.25).

ninth to the second century B.C.; he then takes up each part in chronological turn, presenting the ethical ideas, teachings, and practices of that particular historical period as contained in the contemporary literary material. This method of handling the subject is exact, simple, concrete, explicit; and some effort is made to describe the ethical advance from one historical period to another. The disadvantage of the method is the rather atomistic treatment, without adequate organization of the data and without a satisfactory genetic exposition of the development of Hebrew-Jewish ethics. Mr. Hughes's book deals with a much shorter period, that of later Judaism, 200 B.C.-100 A.D. He makes four topical divisions: (1) "The Moral Ideal," (2) "Moral Evil," (3) "The Will," (4) "Moral Sanctions." In his sub-analysis, however, he too adopts the detailed chronological treatment: under each topic he expounds the idea, (1) in the second-century B.C. literature, (2) in the first-century B.C. literature, (3) in the first-century A.D. literature.

We proceed now to consider Professor Mitchell's contribution to our study. He points out that the Old Testament from beginning to end (that is, from the earliest elements in Genesis and Exodus to the latest elements in Ecclesiastes and Daniel) assumes that man is a moral being, with knowledge and power to choose between good and evil. The right and the wrong are made plain to man by the voice of God and by his own conscience. Ethics and religion are undifferentiated: man's duty is determined by God, made known to him by God, and by God he is held accountable for his conduct, enjoying the divine approval and blessing if he obeys, and suffering the divine wrath and punishment if he is disobedient. This moral imperative runs throughout the Old Testament, from the Genesis story of the expulsion from Eden to the Daniel warning of "shame and everlasting contempt"; a classic passage is the blessings and curses of Deut., chap. 28.

The Hebrew ethics of the historical periods preceding 800 B.C. appear in the Old Testament only in the form of subsequent pedagogical accounts. What we are told of the ethics of the patriarchal period (before 1200 B.C.), of the Exodus and founding of the nation, and of the earlier monarchy (before 800 B.C.) was gathered by the prophets of the ninth, eighth, and seventh centuries B.C. from the Hebrew traditions of their past, and was put into books with successive editing for the purposes of moral-religious education. The document J in its earliest form is assigned to the ninth century, the document E in its earliest form to the eighth century, the combinations and revisions of them to the eighth and seventh centuries. In these centuries the great prophetic movement made a remarkable advance in Hebrew ethics and religion, which is chiefly reflected for us in Genesis, Exodus, Deuteronomy, the Books of Samuel and Kings, Amos, Hosea, Isaiah, and Jeremiah. We may suppose that the narratives in the historical books that report events previous to 800 B.C. preserve in some form and measure the ethics of those earlier days; but it seems likely that in the main even these narratives are edited to convey the ethics of the great prophetic movement that received its highest characteristics in the eighth century B.C. The prophetic ideal of the true, grand, heroic Hebrew is portrayed in Abraham, Joseph, Samuel, and David, whose qualities of character and conduct are variously described. This ideal of manhood is very high and fine: they are men who love and serve their fellows, who show parental and filial affection, fraternal kindness, patience, forgiveness,

magnanimity, hospitality, integrity, and fidelity; they show faith, reverence, and obedience to God; they are penitent for their sins. In fact, it may be that the portrayal of the moral-religious ideal in these well-known biblical heroes furnishes the most widely influential standard and inspiration of the whole Old Testament.

It was in the middle of this eighth century B.C. that the work of Amos, Hosea, Isaiah, and Micah was done, and the books of prophecy that bear their names in the Old Testament were written. These books are first-hand, contemporary sources of the ethical teaching which they record (similar in this respect to the Epistles of Paul as sources for our knowledge of the ethical teaching of primitive Christianity). They expound and demand a higher kind of morality in Israel. They condemn the chief sins of their time: wealth, luxury, idleness, drunkenness, licentiousness, dishonesty, bribery, the violations of oaths, injustice, slavery, the mistreatment of the poor, the orphan and the widow, robbery, adultery, and murder. The great term "righteousness" rings through these writings as the comprehensive term to denote the new Hebrew ideal. It stands over against the elaborate religious ritual at the temple, by which the people sought to win the approval and favor of God. In Amos 5:21-24 we read: "I hate, I despise your feasts, and I will take no delight in your solemn assemblies. Yea, though ye offer me your burnt-offerings and meal-offerings, I will not accept them. . . . But let justice roll down as waters, and righteousness as a mighty stream." Similarly in Hos. 6:6: "I desire kindness, and not sacrifice; and the knowledge of God more than burnt-offerings." Also in Isa. 1:11-17: "I have had enough of the burnt-offerings. . . . Bring no more vain oblations; incense is an abomination unto me. . . . Your new moons and your appointed feasts my soul hateth. . . . And when ye spread forth your hands [in prayer], I will hide mine eyes from you; yea, when ye make many prayers, I will not hear: your hands are full of blood. Wash you, make you clean; put away the evil of your doings from before mine eyes; cease to do evil; learn to do well; seek justice, relieve the oppressed, judge the fatherless, plead for the widow." And Mic. 6:8: "He hath shewed thee, O man, what is good; and what doth Jehovah require of thee. but to do justly, and to love mercy, and to walk humbly with thy God?"

God's attitude toward men, as described by these prophets, was one of long-suffering and yearning, but also of stern warning; if they will repent and turn from their sins, they will be forgiven and blessed. Isa. 1:18 f.: "Though your sins be as scarlet, they shall be as white as snow. . . . If ye be willing and obedient, ye shall eat the good of the land." Mic. 7:18 f.: "Who is a God like unto thee, that pardoneth iniquity? . . . he retaineth not his anger for ever, because he delighteth in lovingkindness. He will again have compassion upon us." But if men continue in their sins, God will chastise them by delivering their land to the foreign conqueror. Then, when they are chastened, God will fulfil his promises of blessing.

Toward the close of the seventh century B.C., a hundred years later than Amos, Hosea, Isaiah, and Micah, the prophet Jeremiah at Jerusalem added his great moral-religious message—a message similar to theirs, with a powerful insistence upon righteousness. Instead of burnt-offering and sacrifice, he demanded moral living (Jer. 7:21-26). He condemned the falsehood, deceit, injustice, oppression, stealing, robbing, murder, and adultery that were common among the people, and even among the prophets (23:14). He fastened upon every individual man

the responsibility for his own sin, and threatened him with divine punishment (Jer. 31:29 f.; cf. Deut. 24:16). His ideal of human duty and his idea of God's attitude toward men reads: "Thus saith Jehovah, Let not the wise man glory in his wisdom, neither let the mighty man glory in his might, let not the rich man glory in his riches; but let him that glorieth glory in this, that he hath understanding, and knoweth me, that I am Jehovah who exerciseth lovingkindness, justice, and righteousness in the earth: for in these things I delight, saith Jehovah" (Jer. 9:23 f.). He announces that God will make a new covenant with his people, "in their heart will I write it; and I will be their God, they shall be my people: . . . they shall all know me, from the least of them unto the greatest of them, saith Jehovah: for I will forgive their iniquity, and their sin will I remember no more" (Jer. 31:33 f.). Then the nation will reach its highest aspirations: "Behold the days come, saith Jehovah, that I will raise unto David a righteous Branch, and he shall reign as king and deal wisely, and shall execute justice and righteousness in the land. In his days Judah shall be saved, and Israel shall dwell safely; and this is his name whereby he shall be called: Jehovah our righteousness" (Jer. 23:5 f.).

In these teachings of the eighth- and seventh-century prophets we have the highest ethical conception of all history up to that time.<sup>1</sup> This ideal of conduct and character is the keynote of the Old Testament ethics; it permeates the Pentateuchal books, the historical books, the Psalms, and the Wisdom books, besides the major and minor prophetic books, because all of these were edited or produced under the dominant influence of the great prophetic movement here characterized. The Hebrew legislation that preceded the time of Amos, Hosea, Isaiah, and Micah was recast in this prophetic period; and the Deuteronomic Code, produced *ca.* 650 B.C., made a marked advance upon earlier codes in the direction of humanitarian principles and provisions.

The Ten Commandments, as we read them in Deut. 5:7-21 (similarly Exod. 20:3-17), present this seventh-century epitome of man's moral-religious duty; they are filled with the prophetic spirit and ideal. This Deuteronomic Decalogue represents a development. The J document of the ninth century and the E document of the eighth century had each contained a Decalogue;<sup>2</sup> but in these two Decalogues the commandments were wholly ritualistic. But this seventh-century Decalogue, prepared under the influence of the great ethical prophets, condenses the ritualistic requirements into four (the first four) commandments, and makes the remaining six commandments specifically ethical. In their highest prophetic form, then, the Ten Commandments were: "(1) Thou shalt have no other gods besides me. (2) Thou shalt not make thyself a graven image. (3) Thou shalt not take the name of Yahweh thy God in vain. (4) Remember to keep the Sabbath day holy. (5) Honor thy father and thy mother. (6) Thou shalt not kill. (7) Thou shalt not commit adultery. (8) Thou shalt not steal.

<sup>1</sup> One notes that this development of the Hebrew moral-religious ideal was attained three centuries earlier than the great ethical movement among the Greeks, which began with Socrates in the latter half of the fifth century B.C.

<sup>2</sup> The J Decalogue may be read in Exod. 34: (1-11) 12-26. The E Decalogue appears partly in certain verses of the later Decalogue in Exod. 20:3-17, and partly in Exod., chaps. 20-23, the Book of the Covenant (Exod. 20:3, 4, 24; 22:29a, 29b, 30; 23:10 f., 12, 15, 16a, 16b).

(9) Thou shalt not bear false witness against thy neighbor. (10) Thou shalt not covet thy neighbor's house."<sup>1</sup> This seventh-century summary of the prophets' teaching and the nation's legislation became the permanent epitome of Judaism; it was so in Jesus' day (Mark 10:19 f.) and it remains so even in our own day.

During the period of the early Jewish ethics, 500-200 B.C., the Hebrew ethics of the preceding prophetic period was maintained as the standard. The Pentateuch, conveying this ethics, was put together into its present composite, five-book form in the fifth century and by 400 B.C. was specifically *canonized*, i.e., established as the formal law and faith of the nation. During the fourth and third centuries the second collection of Old Testament books, the Prophets<sup>2</sup> (by which the Jews meant the historical books as well as the Major and Minor prophetic books), was developed, and by 200 B.C. reached canonization. The five remaining books of the Old Testament, or third group (Job, Psalms, Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, and the Song of Songs) belong also in general in this period, 500-200 B.C. The Psalms were nearly all composed and passed through various stages of collection during these centuries; the same is true of the Proverbs; Job comes from the fourth, third, or second century; Song of Songs from the third or second; Ecclesiastes probably from the early second century.<sup>3</sup> In all this Jewish literature of the Persian and early Greek periods the prophetic ethics of the eighth and seventh centuries was the standard of Judaism.

The fifth century was marked by a strong development of ritualistic practice and law. Assuming the moral-religious standard of Prophetism, its particular aim was to protect, administer, and inculcate this higher ethics and faith by means of an elaborate system of temple sacrifice, worship, and ceremonial observance. This ritualistic movement produced the Priests' Code, which we read in portions of Exodus, Leviticus, and Numbers. The narrative portions of the Pentateuch were also re-edited by the Priests, who put together and gave the final color to the Pentateuch. This priestly movement continued to dominate Judaism for several centuries. In the third century it produced the Books of Chronicles, in which the pre-exilic history of the nation contained in the Books of Samuel and Kings was rewritten from a priestly point of view. The total effect of this priestly

<sup>1</sup> The form of the Decalogue here quoted is from Mitchell's book, p. 177. We suggest that the last word, "house," might have been given as "property," which (according to the customary idea of the time) would include wives, slaves, and work-animals. The wording given above is understood to be only approximate. It is agreed by scholars that the Commandments were ten in number to facilitate memorization (one for each finger of the two hands), and that they were properly in brief form, for the same reason. In the accounts of the Ten Commandments contained in Deut., chap. 5, and Exod., chap. 20, five of the ten appear in this proper brief form (Nos. 1, 6, 7, 8, 9), while the other five (Nos. 2, 3, 4, 5, 10) appear in an elaborated form, with specifications and reasons for obedience; it would have been quite as appropriate and useful to have elaborated the shorter five in a similar way, but that seems not to have been done.

<sup>2</sup> A characteristic term of the Jews for the whole Old Testament was "the Law and the Prophets." See Matt. 5:17; 7:12; 11: 13; 22:40; Luke 16:29, 31; 22:44; John 1:45; Rom. 3:21.

<sup>3</sup> The whole Old Testament collection was practically complete as a sacred body of literature by 100 B.C., and was permanently fixed as Palestinian canon of Scripture by rabbinical scholars about 100 A.D.

activity was in fact to obscure the prophetic ethics, though this was not the intention; the priests were the teachers and exemplars of the Law and the Prophets, the conservators of the moral-religious ideals and customs of the nation.

The later Jewish ethics, of the period 200 B.C.—100 A.D., is helpfully presented to us in Hughes's *Ethics of Jewish Apocryphal Literature*. The author uses but a *portion* of the available literature for the Jewish ethics of this New Testament period. For Palestine, there are the New Testament, Josephus, and the rabbinic writings in addition to the writings which he uses as sources of his information; and for Alexandria there are the writings of Philo. His presentation of the later Jewish ethics, therefore, is partial, not complete. The author's task, however, was large, even when he restricted himself to the Old Testament Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha.<sup>1</sup> These writings together he calls the "Jewish Apocryphal Literature"—a convenient if a somewhat confusing title. The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha arose mainly in Palestine in the Hebrew language, but a minor number of them were written in Greek at Alexandria; our author treats separately the ethical teaching of the two localities. The books that furnished him the chief material were: for Palestine, Sirach, I Enoch, Jubilees, Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs, I Maccabees, Judith, Tobit, Psalms of Solomon, II Baruch, IV Ezra; for Alexandria, Wisdom, II Enoch, II, III, and IV Maccabees, Sibylline Oracles, and III Ezra.<sup>2</sup>

We have already noted that Mr. Hughes makes four topical divisions in his presentation of this Jewish ethical teaching: (1) "The Moral Ideal: Its Content and Development"; (2) "Moral Evil"; (3) "The Will"; (4) "Moral Sanctions."

As to the moral ideal, he finds that "this literature reveals the presence of nobler currents of thought in Judaism than the study of the Gospels would lead us to suspect." Certainly this Judaism of the New Testament period abounds with nobler currents of thought. If he thinks that the Gospels do not indicate this, it is because he falls in with the conventional dogmatic notion that the ethics *condemned* in the teaching of Jesus is the whole of *Jewish* ethics, while the ethics *commended* in the teaching of Jesus is a direct miraculous divine bestowal not genetically related to Judaism. When one takes the *historical* view of Jesus' teaching, he sees that it is the best ethics of Judaism in a higher interpretation, with a message of rebuke to those who fail to rise to this ideal. The Gospels show us Judaism at its best in Jesus, as they show us Judaism at its worst in the "sinners" and the "hypocrites." Hughes recognizes on p. 141 that there was a good as well as a bad pharisaism.<sup>3</sup> He finds in this period also a distinct advance in the

<sup>1</sup> See his table of the literature, with the date and place of composition of each book, on p. 20.

<sup>2</sup> A concise, first-class description of these writings (in addition to Hughes's first chapter) may be read in Charles's *Religious Development between the Old and New Testaments*, chaps. vii and viii. This small book is most illuminating for the Judaism out of which Christianity arose. A much larger work, of similar purpose and quality, is Oesterley's, *The Books of the Apocrypha*.

<sup>3</sup> To clear up this whole matter of the moral character of the Pharisees in Jesus' day one should read the recent book by Herford, entitled *Pharisaism*. The characterization of the Pharisees in the Gospels is of the worst element and aspect of the Pharisees that opposed and brought about the death of Jesus.



Jewish conceptions of faith and grace, compared with works, as the condition of salvation: "thus in the most ethical and spiritual circles of Judaism, the inadequacy of the external method of salvation was being realized, and the need of a gospel of faith and grace was being felt."

Moral evil, according to the Jewish conception, consisted in disobedience to the will of God, as expressed in the Old Testament Scriptures—in the Law primarily, but also in the Prophets. Jewish interest was practical rather than metaphysical, but by this time there was a well-developed theory of the constitution of human nature, a doctrine of a fall and original sin, as an explanation of the origin of moral evil. This speculation appears chiefly in the apocryphical writings, but is not absent even from the opposite type of writings, the Wisdom books (e.g., Sirach). According to one view, evil began with the sin of Adam (Gen., chap. 3); according to another view, it was the result of the (mythological) union of angels with women (Gen. 6:1-4); and according to a third view, evil was due to bad impulses innate in man. The specific sins that are prominently and repeatedly condemned in this literature are: licentiousness, envy, anger, hatred, covetousness, intemperance, deceit, lying, hypocrisy.

The will is a subject upon which the Jews maintained a practical doctrine. In the Old Testament and in the later Jewish writings it is obvious that Judaism held firmly to the moral capability and responsibility of man. The prophetic and the scribal teaching assumed this, as Jesus did. The cosmological, biological, and sociological difficulties of this conception did not much trouble them; their attitude was homiletical and administrative rather than philosophical. With equal concreteness and certainty they held to the almightiness of God and his predestination of all things. The antinomy between the divine sovereignty and human freedom was simply allowed to stand, as both ideas seemed true and necessary to one's view of life.

Moral sanctions are those considerations which give force and authority to moral principles and laws. The answer which one gives to the question, "Why be good?" will indicate the moral sanctions which one thinks operative. External moral sanctions are those which control one from outside himself—the laws or opinions of men, with attached penalties for disobedience; or the will of God made known to men, with attached divine rewards and punishments, present and future. Internal moral sanctions are those which the individual brings to bear upon himself—his conscience, his desire for social approval, his aspiration toward the moral ideal. Judaism was a social order, with a regular organization of social control. The civic and criminal law of the nation was ably developed and enforced. Also, the Jewish people were deeply religious in their conception of duty; they believed God had made known his will to them in the Old Testament, and that he would bless them if they obeyed or punish them if they disobeyed. The earlier notion was that he blessed or punished the nation or individuals immediately, and that disease, misfortune, and catastrophe were his chastisement, while happiness, health, and prosperity were his reward. The inadequacy of this conception came gradually into view. A doctrine of eschatological rewards and punishments, with the Judgment as the day of the decision and entrance upon these future destinies, was well established in Judaism by 200 B.C., with some influence of the Persian religion in the development of these Jewish ideas. The

Gospels show that Jesus found and made full use of the eschatological sanction. "There is general agreement that the eternal destiny of the soul is determined by the character of its life in the present world." Future retribution is conceived externally rather than as the natural result of the operation of moral processes in the soul. Resurrection and eternal life are the externally given rewards of virtue, and eternal punishment the externally imposed penalty of transgression. "At the same time we can discern a groping movement toward a comprehension of the fact that moral laws are self-acting."

A comparison of the ethical teaching of Jesus with that of the Old Testament and later Jewish literature leads one to recognize that Jesus was genetically a Jew, mentally and morally (as well as physically), and that he found his point of view, his inspiration, his impulse, and his message in the Scriptures and the best Judaism of his day. He represents the best spirit, knowledge, and faith of the greatest prophets of the nation. He was a profound student and advocate of the Law and the Prophets, which "he came, not to destroy, but to fulfil" (Matt. 5:17). This is by no means to make Jesus a mere repeater of Old Testament and scribal ideas and phrases; on the contrary, he *re-created*, according to his own ethical insight, judgment, and impulse, the ethical message of Judaism. He elevated Jewish ethics so distinctly, he reformed Judaism so thoroughly, that the scribes and Pharisees—the official moral-religious teachers and leaders of his nation—rejected him; and the Gentiles of the Mediterranean world, whom Jewish ethics had failed to win, became converts to his gospel.

#### Questions for Discussion

1. Can we understand Jesus apart from the Hebrew-Jewish literature?
2. What books of the Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha are the most valuable?
3. How explain historically the great ethical advance in Israel with the pre-exilic prophets?
4. What general periods do we note in the growth of the Hebrew-Jewish ethics?
5. How does the history of the Ten Commandments illustrate the ethical growth of the nation?
6. How did the Jews of Jesus' day regard the Old Testament? How did Jesus regard it?
7. What were the moral sanctions of Judaism?
8. Why did Jesus criticize certain ethical ideas and practices of his people?
9. How shall we describe the originality of Jesus in the field of ethics?

#### Books for Further Reading

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| Charles, <i>Religious Development between the Old and New Testaments</i> .    | Bousset, <i>Jesus</i> , especially chap. viii.                |
| Montefiore, <i>The Religious Teaching of Jesus</i> , especially chaps. i, ii. | Kent, <i>The Life and Teachings of Jesus</i> .                |
| Herford, <i>Pharisaism</i> .  | Briggs, <i>The Ethical Teaching of Jesus</i> .                |
| Neumann, <i>Jesus</i> , especially chaps. iv, ix, xi, xii.                    | Pfleiderer, <i>Christian Origins</i> , especially pp. 59-130. |